

Citation for published version:

Marshall, H 2011, 'Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools', *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, vol. 9, no. 3-4, pp. 411-426.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605325>

DOI:

[10.1080/14767724.2011.605325](https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605325)

Publication date:

2011

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article published in Marshall, H., 2011. Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 411-426, copyright Taylor & Francis, available online at:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14767724.2011.605325>

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools

Harriet Marshall*

Department of Education, University of Bath, UK

This paper exposes the tensions between different agendas and calls for what is loosely called ‘global citizenship education’ by developing a set of sociological conceptual tools useful for engaging with associated educational forms and ideals. It presents the instrumentalist and normative agendas at play within global citizenship education policy, theory and practice. Recent theoretical critiques of more mainstream global citizenship education are considered, encapsulated in calls for a form of ‘cosmopolitan learning’. This learning is associated with the development of epistemic virtues (Rizvi 2009) and calls for an epistemological shift (Andreotti 200?) in the way knowledge, learning and identities are seen. It is argued that there is much to be gained from this recent body of academic work, but that it must also be accompanied by empirically-informed understandings of current school contexts and the hegemonic notions of corporate cosmopolitan capital at play. The position is taken that no matter how global citizenship education is theorised, key theoretical, conceptual, and practical questions need to be asked that expose the normative, universalist and instrumentalist agendas at play.

Key words: global citizenship education; cosmopolitan learning; instrumentalism.

Sociological research in education has always been concerned with how the social is transmitted and reproduced in schools and, now that the social is no longer just local (if, indeed, it ever has been), that focus must take into account deliberate attempts to reproduce and recontextualise global knowledge and global societal ideals in educational settings. In the UK there has been a proliferation of calls to educate young people ‘for the 21st Century’, ‘for the global knowledge-based economy’ (DfES 2004), ‘for a just and sustainable world’ (DEA 2009), and ‘for global citizenship’ (Oxfam 2006). Some schools, teachers and organisations have set about creating globally-oriented curricula, devising global learning practices and receiving recognition for this kind of work through receipt of specific school awards such as the English government’s Department for Children Schools and Families’ (DCSF) ‘International School Award’ – however, in the UK there are also a large number of schools for whom non-statutory and non-government inspected global citizenship education is not a priority.

This paper sets out to consider the tensions between different agendas and calls for what is loosely called ‘global citizenship education’. Whilst readers might be more familiar with related terms – such as international education, global education/learning, development education or education for sustainable development/global understanding – the term global citizenship education is used in part because it is increasingly visible in a number of educational fields and traditions (for a more in depth discussion on this terminology debate see Marshall 2007). The related term,

* Email: h.marshall@bath.ac.uk

‘cosmopolitan learning’, is also used in this paper, differentiated from global citizenship education in that the former appears to be more confined to philosophically-informed and predominantly theoretical academic writings. Whilst it is recognised that the two terms (global citizenship education and cosmopolitan learning) are interchanged in both educational theorisation and practice, the distinction is useful for the purposes of this paper. Quite significantly, global citizenship is as a politically contested and instrumental concept used to achieve a vision of ‘the social’ in education.

The paper first introduces global citizenship education before presenting some of the instrumentalist agendas at play within global citizenship education policy and practice – on one level instrumentalism is understood as meaning ‘agenda-driven’ and is oft associated with an technical-economic agenda, although a more wide-ranging definition is adopted and developed here. It then gives an overview of, and critically engages with, some of the critiques of these agendas. These critiques are categorised as advocating a form of ‘cosmopolitan learning’ through the development of epistemic virtues (Rizvi 2008; 2009), often accompanied by calls for an epistemological shift (Andreotti 200?) in the way knowledge, learning and identities are seen. There is much to be gained from this latter, recent body of academic work, but I argue that it must be accompanied by more practical and empirically-informed understandings of current school contexts and the hegemonic notions of corporate cosmopolitan capital at play – in other words, no matter how global citizenship education is theorised, there are key theoretical, conceptual, and practical questions that need to be asked that expose the normative and instrumentalist agendas at play. The arguments presented here are located first within a UK context, though many of the references come from, and will have resonance for, educators working in other international contexts.

Global citizenship education

The current trend towards educating for global citizenship or cosmopolitanism can be attributed to a perceived set of global crises (Todd 2009) and to the realisation that schools are always part of global networks and flows of information, goods and people (Urry 2000). Global forms of citizenship education have, in part, come about in reaction against the trend that national education should ‘chiefly convey knowledge and stimulate pupils to acquire knowledge, encouraging them to embrace fundamental values within that nation’ (Roth 2008:14-15). Roth also highlights how the market-economic discourse permeating schools means that ‘everywhere in the world education systems are under pressure to produce individuals for global competition, individuals who can compete for their own positions in a global context’ (Daun 2002, quoted in Roth 2007:16). Not surprisingly therefore calls for the development of global citizenship education, international education, cosmopolitan learning or a form of ‘global mindedness’ in schools come from a wide range of different organisations – from inter-governmental bodies, national governments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the media and the voluntary and business sectors. These calls cover an equally diverse range of agendas, including sustainability, intercultural understanding, economic integration, skills and knowledge for the global economy, human rights, and social justice and equality. All calls must be contextualised with care however – historically, politically, culturally, and geographically – and situated among wider instrumentalist agendas.

In the UK the idea of global citizenship education is increasingly familiar to schools and to organisations and individuals that work with them. An oft referenced source is Oxfam's curriculum for global citizenship (2006), intended to foster the 'knowledge, skills and values needed for securing a just and sustainable world in which all may fulfil their potential', give 'children and young people the opportunity to develop critical thinking about complex global issues in the safe space of the classroom', and embrace a global citizenry ideal based on respecting and valuing diversity, acting responsibly and being 'outraged' by social injustice (Oxfam 2006:1-3). Whilst some, such as Andreotti (2006), have criticised the lack of theorisation of global citizenship education (in England in particular), a body of work is emerging. There are, for instance, those who theorise and engage with global citizenship education in relation to the philosophy of cosmopolitanism, extending models of cosmopolitanism and Kantian cosmopolitan democracy offered by those such as Held (1995). This discourse often talks about those whose loyalties, values, knowledge and norms go beyond the national towards trans-national commonalities (Roth 2007). Nussbaum (2002) contrasts cosmopolitan universalism and internationalism with 'parochial ethnocentrism' and 'inward-looking patriotism', although there are recognisably different types of cosmopolitanism out there (Beck 2006; Rizvi 2008). Advocates of this sort of global citizenship education argue that 'citizenship education should also help students to develop an identity and attachment to the world' (Banks 2008:134).

Weenink (2008) outlines two arguments within cosmopolitan theory that can be observed in what he calls international educational activity – the idea of 'awareness of global connectedness' and the idea of 'an orientation of open mindedness towards the Other' (2008:1089-90). His argument is that a number of upper-middle class parents in the Netherlands aspire to a model of cosmopolitan education for their children based on notions of global connectedness as part of their social reproduction strategy, providing them with knowledge, skills and assets that 'give their offspring a competitive edge in the globalizing social arenas' (ibid.:1093). Such a position may, or may not encourage 'open-mindedness towards the Other'. His useful conceptualisation of 'cosmopolitan capital' will be revisited later in this paper.

There are many ways of differentiating these calls, but it is helpful to begin by first identifying the ultimate agenda or goal of the global citizenry experience imagined by the proponent – the *ideal* – and, second, by probing the levels and types of engagement advocated by the call for global citizenship education – the *intensity*. In relation to identifying the ideal, one way of engaging with global citizenship education entails exposing the 'type' of global citizen that is ultimately being *imagined* by the proponents. This first involves recognising the existence of multiple global citizenships (or cosmopolitanisms). For example, Urry (1998) considers the existence of several possible global citizenships: global capitalists 'who seek to unify the world around global corporate interests which are increasingly "de-nationalised"'; global reformers, global environmental managers and earth citizens 'who seek to take responsibility for the globe through a distinct and often highly localised ethics of care'; and global networkers 'who set up and sustain work or leisure networks constituted across national boundaries' (1998:4). Urry goes on to identify a fourth category of 'global cosmopolitans' who develop 'an ideology of openness towards "other" cultures, peoples and environments' and who are concerned about developing an 'orientation' to other 'citizens, societies and cultures across the globe' (ibid.). This

plurality of global citizenships suggests that some global citizenships may clash with others (especially those with contrasting agendas).

In relation to identifying the ‘intensity’ or level of active involvement (e.g. emotional, practical, knowledge/understanding) it is useful to develop a typology of different levels of engagement. Weenink (2008) begins such a typology when problematising to what extent and how global citizenship education ideals entail an orientation to the Other and to what extent the educational experience is based upon a set of carefully selected and economically-oriented global issues. Another method of engagement with global citizenship education differences is to analyse the pedagogical approaches advocated, and to what extent the pedagogical and curricular recommendations for schools are complementary or antagonistic to current practice (e.g. knowledge structures and pedagogies). These typologies could act as useful tools for engagement with empirical research of global citizenship education practice.

In contrast, a more straightforward task entails summarising the similarities between current global citizenship education initiatives and philosophical orientations. Global citizenship education recommendations of all different types invariably incorporate a holistic understanding of learning (Roth 2007:25) and, most importantly, have a strong normative dimension. This dimension reveals itself in the way calls articulate a particular vision of a ‘better future’ entrenched in a set of norms and values about perceived political, economic and cultural conditions and the possible futures these might permit. However, the humanist and often universalist ideals of the social justice activist *or* the economist can be a cause for concern when the global citizenry ideal being proposed and recontextualised in schools is that of the adult and not of the child. This critique, for example, might be articulated by advocates of a more child-centred approach to global citizenship education or anyone that believes the imagined global futures of adults will not necessarily be appropriate for the next generation. Another unifying feature amongst different types of global citizenship educations is that they tend to begin from a point of agreement about what Rizvi considers to be key features of our ‘global interconnectivity’, which is often assumed to be ‘an empirical reality resulting from the ease with which goods, finance, people, ideas and media are now able to flow across the world, leading to a radical shift in our understanding of space and time’ (2009:257). Crucially, this idea of global connectivity places emphasis on ‘the role people themselves play in forging and sustaining conceptions’ of it and as such is ‘defined by popular consciousness’ (ibid.) and is very much part of the social imagination. Moreover, global citizenship education discourse rarely recognises that this presumed ‘empirical reality’ is entrenched within a liberal-democratic framework that assumes all citizens have the same rights, opportunities and responsibilities, when some marginalised communities and individuals in the world experience a very different lived-reality (Balarin 2010).

To summarise, we can see that there are different types of global citizenship education with different agendas, but these currently have a number of key similarities especially when placed in Western, liberal-economic country contexts.

Tools for analysis: pluralism, power and cosmopolitan capital

To explain current global citizenship education trends and their associated agendas I present a set of seemingly straightforward conceptual tools to facilitate critical

analysis, which collectively begin to create a theoretical framework for engaging with global citizenship education in schools.

The first concept is that of pluralism – in particular human pluralism and pluralism of ideas and worldviews – which is enhanced by also invoking the sociological idea of the ‘social imaginary’. For example, by first recognising the plurality of global citizenships and global citizenship educations the corresponding *imagined* communities, citizenships, global citizens and futures at work can then be explored. Locating and situating these imaginaries, manifested in the discourses and ideologies of the individuals, groups and policies at play in the field of global citizenship education and in their political-economic contexts, can also take place. For example, problematising global citizenships leads to a recognition of the plurality of levels of citizenry engagement at the local and national level, where some people may be able to exercise full citizenship rights and responsibilities whilst others might be considerably marginalised from these. A pluralist perspective also helps challenge the dominance of binaries so often found in educational discourse and, instead, expose a more complex picture of global citizenship education that forces educationalists to blur the distinctions between global and local, economic and non-economic, justice and injustice, human and inhuman and so forth.

Todd summarises her interpretation of human pluralism as ‘not simply about the aggregation of identities, or communities to which one belongs, but [is] specific to the relationships, communicative contexts, languages, and internal dynamics through which one makes attachment to the world’ (2009:2). A pluralist perspective facilitates recognition of the situated and imaginary nature of different forms of global citizenship education (Marshall 2009). This perspective has the potential to expose citizenship realities, disparities and inequalities by recognising the political-economic context in which these global citizenry ideals emerge. Schools develop pedagogical and curricular responses to this plurality of global citizenships and global agendas within their particular socio-economic contexts, and identify ways in which individuals can choose to respond or relate to the global. Different advocates of global citizenship education (e.g. NGO workers or governmental officials) will inevitably prioritise certain global citizen ‘types’ according to their particular agendas. To summarise, the language of plurality facilitates debate about the universalising impulses within education and embraces an element of ambiguity – however, this is not to say that a form of ‘qualified universalism’ (Enslin and Tjiattas 2009) is not a useful and necessary goal in global citizenship education projects.

The second vital and interlinked concept is that of power – this helps maintain an ethically-grounded sociological project intent on contesting and exposing hegemonic relations. By bringing to the fore issues of power, we are able to expose instrumentalist agendas and discourses within education, and a researcher is able to better investigate those that are at least perceived to be the more dominant forms of global citizenship education and why. An analysis of power (and control) suggests unearthing those relations and practices that reinforce traditional power structures in education and in wider society. It is directly in relation to power that the notion of instrumentalism is understood in this paper. On one level instrumentalism is understood to mean ‘agenda-driven’ guided by a particular strategy or vision. On another level it is important to appreciate that different forms of instrumentalism exist, for example some agendas aim to maintain whilst others aim to transform the

status quo, which in turn are able to exert different levels of power within society. Whilst many educational initiatives have an instrumentalist agenda, of great significance is the extent to which they also adopt, for example, a pragmatic, critical, moral, emotional and/or hegemonic (or, in contrast, marginalised) position.

To further assist the analysis of power in education, the theoretical constructs of social capital (linked to the benefits of being in certain groups, networks or relationships of influence and support), and cultural capital (linked to forms of knowledge, skills, education and advantages giving people a higher societal status) are useful for theorising and analysing global citizenship education. For example, articulations of 'cosmopolitan capital' (Weenink 2008) and 'critical ecological capital' (Huckle 2004) can be discovered in global citizenship education theory and research where the distinction between social and cultural capital is blurred. In the context of cosmopolitanisation theory and talk of a 'new international social class' or 'new global elites', Weenink identifies cosmopolitan capital as:

...a propensity to engage in globalizing social arena... [it] comprises bodily and mental predispositions and competencies (savoir faire) which help to engage confidently in such arenas. Moreover it provides a competitive edge, a head start vis-à-vis competitors. People accumulate, deploy and display cosmopolitan capital while living abroad for some time, visit and host friends from different nationalities, attend meetings frequently for an international audience, maintain a globally dispersed circle of friends or relatives, read books, magazines, and journals that reach a global audience and possess a near-native mastery of English and at least one other language. (2008:1092)

This aspiration should be placed in its neo-liberal political and economic context where there is a struggle for privileged positions in the labour and educational markets for example – although it is an understanding not entirely out of place in other parts of the world. Rizvi (2008) expresses concern about the dominance of this interpretation of cosmopolitanism in Western contexts (a liberal individualist cosmopolitanism entrenched within the norms/values of the global economy), pointing to the existence of more reflective forms. However, more recently Rizvi (2009) emphasises how important it is to still recognise the power of what he calls 'corporate cosmopolitanism', which valorises young people who are 'culturally flexible and adaptable who are able to take advantage of the global processes' and who are 'less concerned with the moral and political dimensions of global connectivity than with education's strategic economic possibilities' (Rizvi 2009:260). The term 'corporate cosmopolitan capital' might therefore be appropriate for those interested in highlighting the most powerful forms of cosmopolitan capital at play in schools.

Weenink (2008) draws upon the work of Szerszynski and Urry to usefully differentiate between three forms of cosmopolitanism that can in turn be used as: (a) different aspects or understandings of cosmopolitan capital; and (b) categories that facilitate the deconstruction of instrumentalist agendas in global citizenship education discourse. I have adapted, re-interpreted and simplified these here:

- 1) *Global knowledge*: 'an awareness of the current global socio-cultural condition', perceived and experienced, either as a 'relatively autonomous force' shaping lives, or as an increased awareness of 'everyday global connectedness' (Weenink 2008:1092). Leading to exploring relationships

between global economic knowledge and that relating more to global social justice, poverty alleviation, social development and social change.

- 2) *Global engagement*: a 'mode of orientation to the world' (2008:1092), where the question is to what extent the aim is for young people to be aware, open-minded, interested or actively engaged in the global arena. Another question is whether that particular level of engagement is more in the global economic (e.g. aspiring to become a part of the global capitalist system) or global social justice arena (e.g. being outraged by social injustice) or both.
- 3) *Global competences*: a 'set of competences' or 'resources' that help young people 'make their way within other cultures and countries and/or that...give... a competitive edge in globalizing social arenas' (2008:1092-3).

Two types of dominant cosmopolitan citizens are identified in order to differentiate the parents interviewed by Weenink about their educational aspirations for their children: 'pragmatic cosmopolitans' or those that regard international education as an instrument for a later career or study and who prioritise, for example, the learning of English; and 'dedicated cosmopolitans' who have a 'mental disposition about taking the world as their horizon, daring to look and go beyond borders, and be open to foreign cultures' (2008:1095). This differentiation is fairly crude, and if one incorporated further understandings, for example by drawing upon Urry's (1998) multitude of global citizenships, one might arrive at a more nuanced understanding of how parents constructed themselves. It is clear, however, that different advocates of global citizenship education (e.g. NGO workers or governmental officials) prioritise certain global citizenship forms and cosmopolitan capital ideals (such as corporate cosmopolitan capital) over others according to their particular agendas. It is to these agendas we shall now turn.

Instrumental agendas in global citizenship education

A valid concern with many forms of global citizenship education is that proponents advocate a future-oriented curricula (selected knowledge) and pedagogy (selected educational relationships and theories of learning) that espouse a particular adult view of the world and its future. With this concern in mind, and having recognised the existence of a plurality of different types of global citizenships and therefore global citizenship educations, it is also important to place these various forms within the context of powerful economic, sometimes called 'technical' instrumentalist agendas – a context that reproduces the ideals embodied in corporate cosmopolitan capital. Technical-economic instrumentalism reminds us that 'the curriculum has always been, albeit selectively, related to economic changes and the future employability of students' (Young 2008:22). Technical instrumentalists are often the dominant group in education policy creation, 'for them the curriculum imperative is not educational in the traditional sense, but directed towards what they see as the needs of the economy', in other words 'preparing for the global more competitive knowledge-based economy of the future' (ibid.: 20).

The technical-economic instrumentalist agenda of much of the global citizenship education policy requires of students (and teachers) a pragmatic and mostly neo-liberal understanding of legal structures, rights and responsibilities. Plenty of evidence exists for the dominance of the technical-economic instrumentalist agenda in schools. One illustration of the dominance of the economic agenda in global

citizenship education policy in the UK can be found in the document *Putting the World into World Class Education* (2004) (and its follow-up action plan DfES 2007). Despite the need to 'instil a strong global dimension into the learning experience of all children and young people' and to 'support the improvement of education and children's services worldwide', the overarching goal advocated by this document is to equip young people and adults 'for life in a global society and work in a global economy' and to ensure that the EU becomes 'the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world' (DfES 2004: 3). Learning in a global context is therefore understood by the UK government as being about equipping employers, employees and students with 'the skills needed for a global economy' such as the learning of economically-useful languages (ibid. 2004:6, also an oft cited parental aspiration in Weenink's study, 2008). This is a good illustration of what Rizvi (2008) describes as an intercultural and cosmopolitan education within the logic of consumption, one placed firmly within existing global economic conditions reproducing the powerful corporate cosmopolitan ideals.

Another manifestation of the economic-instrumentalist agendas of some forms of global citizenship or international education is seen in Whitehead's study of the marketising practices of international schools and their selective marketing of the benefits of the IB (the International Baccalaureate, Whitehead 2005) to prospective parents. From the advertisements of forty South-Australian schools offering the IB, Whitehead discovered that the schools were 'selling social advantage rather than social justice' where the IB was presented as 'a commodity which enhances the former' (2005:2-3). In other words, 'pragmatic realism overrides the IB's humanitarian and socially just ideals' with the result that 'student identities are being reconstructed along individualistic lines as these schools teach the skills required of the entrepreneurial individual in the corporate workplace rather than a socially responsible citizen' (Whitehead 2005:10). A critique of this paper, however, concerns the uncritical and uncontextualised way in which Whitehead engages with the neo-liberal ideals of the school as a place to transmit certain values and civic ideals.

The discourse of 'instrumentalism' is frequently used in relation to efforts to raise standards in schools and where educational policy is increasingly directed to achieve political and economic goals. Working in a UK context, Young (2008) has argued that the two main expressions of instrumentalism in educational policy are marketisation and regulation (sometimes called 'quality assurance') – and that these trends have received criticism from both the political right and left. A neo-conservative critique of the technical instrumentalist agenda might emphasise the reinforcement of curricular subjects and structures. A leftist and/or neo-Marxist perspective might argue that hegemonic capitalist economic models must be de-centred.

An instrumentalist agenda sees education, the curriculum and knowledge as a means to an end, not as ends in themselves. As Young argues 'it is the curriculum's role in making a particular form of society that is stressed' (Young 2008:21). However, the technical-economic instrumentalist discourse is not the only one apparent amongst calls for global citizenship education in schools and their associated societal ideals. Many of those more on the political left (and in some religious groups) engaged in education for global social justice and human rights for example, are also overtly or covertly engaged in their own instrumentalist agenda. Whilst the term instrumentalism has more often been associated with an economic (and pragmatic)

agenda, I argue that it is also a term that can apply to the work of some of those engaged in promoting education for a ‘particular type’ of active and impassioned global citizenship and social change – such as that which intends for young people to join particular ideologically-driven global causes and agendas and advocates a cosmopolitan capital ideal (sometimes in opposition to the type of corporate capital mentioned earlier and without fully acknowledging the dominant position of the latter in wider society).

The global social-justice instrumentalism that requires an emotional and often active commitment to, and understanding of, particular interpretations of economic, political, legal or cultural injustice can also be found in global citizenship education policy and practice. However the status of this type of agenda may in fact be extremely marginal in schools. Oxfam (2006) advocates that young people become outraged by injustice – although its model of the ideal global citizen appears to be situated in a Western, neo-liberal and arguably economically stable country context. Some advocates of education for sustainable development (ESD) have also described the purpose of ESD as the development of ‘positive attitudes and behaviour’, the realisation of sustainability indicators, and delivery of ‘relevant knowledge’ as outlined in particular policy documents (Huckle 2004). In other words, the instrumentalism of some deeply normative global citizenship education policy and practice is intended to ‘balance the economic or instrumental values that modern society places on (and extracts from) nature with ecological, aesthetic, scientific, existence and spiritual values’ (ibid. 2004:7).

Another complexity is associated with the idea of education *for* global citizenship as opposed to education through or about global citizenship education (highlighted by Dobson 2003 in relation to environmental citizenship) – linked to the more often cited difference between education *for* and education *about* citizenship (Beck 1998). The notion of education ‘for’ global citizenship, implies that there is an agreed understanding of global citizenship or sustainable development that educationalists can work towards, and with this an agreed knowledge base. However, it is currently difficult to identify any such agreement in any form unless you examine particular (and ‘exceptional’) curricular programmes like that of the International Baccalaureate.

Whilst other instrumentalist agendas might also exist it is interesting to explore the tensions between the technical-economic and the global social justice agendas in relation to their co-existence in global citizenship education. The two agendas are in themselves highly complex and increasingly indistinguishable – although by examining research featuring the dominance of the knowledge-economy discourse (contained in a number of forms in Lauder et. al. 2006) and the economic-instrumentalist agendas in education around the world, it would be wise to re-emphasise of the comparatively reduced powers of the social justice agendas. *Putting the world into world class education* (DfES 2004) interestingly lists the eight key concepts – diversity, interdependence, social justice, sustainable development, and so forth – which originate from the NGO-written document *Developing the global dimension in the school curriculum* (DfES 2005). But of course the DfES, a governmental education department, probably sees these concepts in quite a different light from the way in which, for example, a development education NGO such as Oxfam or Save the Children (with more overt social justice agendas) may view them.

From a research perspective we need to find out how schools negotiate the tensions between these agendas. It is also important to observe and investigate to what extent schools and educationalists are aware of the particular ideological, cultural, political and historical context out of which these drivers for global citizenship arise. Whether it is Weenink's articulation of cosmopolitan capital, the Welsh Assembly's idea of education for sustainable development and global citizenship (DCELLS 2008) or UNICEF-UK's promotion of global citizenship and human rights education, such calls for these types of education in schools need to be historically, culturally, geographically and politically situated. It is also important to expose the universalist and normative dimensions of these calls, a project begun in the next section.

Weakening the instrumental and adding complexity to the normative: calls for a new type of 'cosmopolitan learning'

A major criticism levelled at the sort of global citizenship education agendas outlined above has manifested itself in the writing of a handful of academics. Particularly critical of the strong universalist and normative dimensions of global citizenship education theory and practice, theorists such as Todd (2008), Andreotti (200?) and Rizvi (2009) have set about borrowing from postcolonial theory to articulate their concerns (although none, especially not Rizvi, recommend the anti-universalist position debated in Enslin and Tjiattas 2009). For example Andreotti advocates 'decolonising the imagination'. Her commentary is especially directed at teachers and students engaging in global citizenship education who have been,

...cognitively over-socialised within Enlightenment ideals and have developed an emotional investment in universalism (i.e. the projection of their ideas as what everyone else should believe), stability (i.e. the avoidance of conflict and complexity), consensus (i.e. the elimination of difference) and fixed identities organised in hierarchical ways (e.g. us, who know; versus 'them' who don't know) (200?:7).

In keeping with the theoretical approach of this paper, the ideas of 'the global' and correspondingly 'global citizenship' need to be seen as social constructs. Rizvi reminds us, for example, that different cosmopolitan ideals and ideas of global connectivity tend to be strongly related to particular historical and political contexts, and that currently global connectivity has placed a new emphasis on the role of imagination in social life (2008:257). Tools and theories to aid critique of the socially and historically constructed nature of 'the global', global citizenship, cosmopolitanism or the globalisation phenomena therefore need to be found.

Andreotti (2006; 2007) has developed an effective theoretical framework for critiquing global citizenship education discourse and for engaging with indigenous perspectives of global and development agendas in global citizenship education. She usefully draws upon the work of Andrew Dobson and Gayatri Spivak to engage with the dominant global constructs in global citizenship education literature and discourse which Spivak might see as reinforcing 'eurocentrism and triumphalism as people are encouraged to think that they live in the centre of the world, that they have a responsibility to 'help the rest' and that 'people from other parts of the world are not fully global'' (Andreotti 2006:5). The 'global dimension' of education (a term more frequently found in educational literature and policy in England, e.g. DfES 2005) is defined in terms of the previously considered eight key concepts. Global citizenship is

supposedly one of those concepts that a curriculum incorporating a global dimension should address. However, Andreotti has critiqued global dimension literature and discourse from a postcolonial perspective for articulating the notion that ‘different cultures only have ‘traditions beliefs and values’’ while ‘the West’ has,

... (universal) knowledge (and even constructs knowledge about these cultures). The idea of a ‘common history’, which only acknowledges the contribution of other cultures to science and mathematics... projects the values, beliefs and traditions of the West as global and universal, while foreclosing the historical processes that led to this universalisation. (Andreotti, 2006:5)

Having also critiqued the philosophical underpinnings of contemporary forms of global citizenship education, Todd, Roth and Rizvi engage (albeit in slightly different ways) with the idea of ‘cosmopolitan learning’ as an alternative pedagogical and epistemological approach to education. Roth’s position is that a learning approach should be devised that is not predominantly linked to or characterised by ‘the values, knowledge and norms of the majority culture’, but recognises that ‘individuals are the bearers of multiple identities, experience loyalty towards people and groups in different ways; that nations are pluralistic and that they are being increasingly challenged by global changes in social, political and economic terms’ (Roth 2007:23). Todd’s particular concern is that global citizenship education projects ‘face humanity’ in a more honest fashion. She argues that if global citizenship education is to succeed in its aim for a more peaceful existence ‘that fully recognises the plurality of human lives’, then it ‘must do so without appealing to an idealised humanity that is solely based on universal intrinsic goodness’, instead confronting violence and hatred as an intrinsic part of humanity itself (Todd 2008:9). Her concern with some global citizenship education practice is that it idealises human possibilities without recognising human limits, which includes labelling certain acts as ‘inhuman’ when, in fact, they are essentially human acts. Todd’s catchphrase question is: ‘how do we imagine an education that seeks not to cultivate humanity...but instead seeks to face it—head on, so to speak, without sentimentalism, idealism or false hope?’ (ibid.). Whilst Todd’s arguments are predominantly at the philosophical level, without a clear pedagogical solution for schools, she does offer a philosophy of learning that emphasises pluralism, criticality, reflexivity, complexity and diversity as well as offering a pertinent warning to global educators,

So long as cosmopolitanism aims to mould, encourage, or cultivate in youth a humanity that is already seen as ‘shared’ it prevents us from confronting the far more difficult and much closer task at hand of facing the troublesome aspects of human interaction that emerge in specific times and places (2008:21).

Rizvi’s form of cosmopolitan learning also involves the development of a more critical global imagination in global citizenship education, one that recognises that cultural differences are ‘neither absolute nor necessarily antagonistic but deeply interconnected and relationally defined’ (2009:255). In the light of postcolonial critiques of certain forms of international and cosmopolitan education, Rizvi advocates a form of cosmopolitan learning that is,

... not concerned so much with imparting knowledge and developing attitudes and skills for understanding other cultures per se, but with helping students examine the ways in

which global processes are creating conditions of economic and cultural exchange that are transforming our identities and communities; and that, unreflexively, we may be contributing to the production and reproduction of those conditions through our uncritical acceptance of the dominant ways of thinking about global interconnectivity (2009: 265-266).

Rizvi recognises that this form of learning still has an instrumentalist agenda of sorts, and that a form of cosmopolitanism is useful only ‘if we are to use it as an instrument of critical understanding and moral improvement’. His vision is that cosmopolitan education should empirically work towards discovering ‘greater clarity over how global transformations are re-shaping our lives’ and, normatively, ‘how we should work with these transformations, creatively and in ways that are potentially progressive’ (2009:263). Both Andreotti and Rizvi emphasise the need for students to reflect upon their own situatedness, their own perspectives, their own critical and political presuppositions, their own global imaginaries and upon the way they create knowledge about ‘others’ and use this knowledge when they engage with them.

In fact, both Rizvi and Andreotti outline a set of pedagogic tools which require (certainly in Andreotti’s case and arguably also in Rizvi’s) an epistemological shift in the thinking and practice of global citizenship educators and researchers. Rizvi (2008; 2009) identifies the key epistemic virtues of historicity, reflexivity, criticality and relationality which are required in any effective cosmopolitan education curricula or form of what he calls ‘cosmopolitan learning’. Similarly, Andreotti’s approach to decolonising the imagination offers a set of key aims for a more effective global citizenship education which aims to equip learners to, for example, ‘examine the origins and implications of their own and other people’s assumptions’, ‘negotiate change’ and ‘establish ethical relationships across linguistic, regional, ideological and representational boundaries (i.e. be open to the Other) and to negotiate principles and values ‘in context’’ (200?:?). Although Rizvi’s work is not referenced, the pedagogical practice she advocates embodies these epistemic virtues, although it might be that Rizvi would further emphasise the idea of ‘relationality’, that is that ‘cultural formations can only be understood in relation to each other, politically forged, historically constituted and globally inter-connected through processes of mobility, exchange and hybridisation’ (2009:267). In turn, it could be said that Andreotti’s explicit ‘reaching out’ agenda, deliberately pitched at advocating this methodological approach might be more impassioned and explicit than Rizvi’s (e.g. see *Through Other Eyes* project, www.throughothereyes.org.uk/).

The table below briefly highlights Andreotti’s pedagogical approach (which takes on board, for example, Todd’s form of cosmopolitan learning) in relation to Rizvi’s epistemic virtues, and as so conceived provides educators with an alternative way of conceiving global citizenship education knowledge and pedagogy.

Andreotti’s (200?) four types of learning in a ‘postcolonial’ global citizenship education	Links to Rizvi’s epistemic virtues
<i>Learning to unlearn</i> – ‘making connections between socio-historical processes and encounters that have shaped our contexts and cultures and the construction of our knowledges and identities’ (200?: p?)	All, especially: (a) <i>Historicity</i> – ‘no set of cultural tradition... can be understood without reference to the historical interactions that produced it’ (2009:266); and (b) <i>Criticality</i> – ‘cosmopolitan learning necessarily challenges the prevailing orthodoxies both about education and about

	cultural formations... contests the hegemonic social imaginaries of globalisation and is implicitly directed towards the goal of global relations that are more just, democratic and humane' (2009:265).
<i>Learning to listen</i> – 'learning to keep our perceptions constantly under scrutiny... possibilities of what we hear (or see) say more about ourselves than what is actually being said or shown' (200?:p?)	All, especially <i>Reflexivity</i> – 'critical recognition of our own cultural and political presuppositions, and the epistemic position from which we speak and negotiate difference' (2009:267).
<i>Learning to learn</i> – 'learning to receive new perspectives, to rearrange and expand our own... understanding that conflict is a productive component of learning and that difference is what makes dialogue and learning relevant' (200?:?)	All, especially <i>Relationality</i> – 'in a world in which flows of information, media symbols and images, and political and cultural ideas are constant and relentless, new cultural formations are inevitable, and can only be relationally comprehended'. Cosmopolitan learning requires 'the development of intellectual skills to examine the ways in which we create knowledge about others and use it to engage with them' (2009:266).
<i>Learning to reach out</i> – 'learning to engage, to learn and to teach with respect and accountability in the complex and uncomfortable intercultural space where identities, power and ideas are negotiated' (200?:?)	No explicit links but does recognise the need to 'help' students engage in cosmopolitan learning (2009:266).

Both authors suggest that an epistemological shift is needed that recognises the tentative nature of knowing, that knowledge is always relational and historically situated, and that learning should begin by recognising and being reflexive about one's own epistemic assumptions. Todd's contribution to this way of thinking relates to her call for cosmopolitan learning to reframe human imperfection, to challenge universalist positions and to take human pluralism seriously.

The work of these theorists is briefly presented here because I believe that it could (collectively) fill a theoretical void in global citizenship education research, and further, that researchers and practitioners in the field could do more to embrace this sort of rigorous engagement with epistemological and ontological issues. However, a word of caution is still required. My position of concern has three dimensions. The first relates to a worry that this kind of critical reading of current global citizenship education practice can sometimes appear overly critical and is not always helpful for those teachers desperately engaged in the task of making their classrooms more sensitive to the global flows that affect their students by incorporating arguably more exciting global citizenship activity and curricula. The role of hope and idealism in the classroom can be a positive force for its members (Halpin 1999), especially those that are otherwise performance-oriented. Linked to this is the concern that some of this theorisation incorporates a seemingly relativist, anti-universalist position, which can have unhelpful pedagogical repercussions for teachers who have to work with notions of right, wrong and truth. This second point relates to a concern that this sort of theorisation and critique is too removed from classroom-based research that recognises the realities of hegemonic and traditional pedagogy, curriculum and exam-oriented practice embedded in schools. While the significance of the technical-economic discourse and instrumentalist agenda is recognised to some extent (for example in Rizvi's discussion of corporate cosmopolitanism), the third dimension of

my critique (of the critiques) is that the sheer power of this agenda/discourse within schools and its impact upon the everyday experiences of young people (and teachers), is understated.

The three concerns above are not to be read as a defence of current practice (although I believe there is much to be celebrated). Rather they reflect the view that critiques of current global citizenship education practice can become preoccupied by theory, abstraction and by an alternative educational ideal, without fully taking into account the economic contexts, and pedagogic and curricula realities and traditions within schools. This might be in part because they rarely articulate the processes and structures for transition required in order to reach these new cosmopolitan learning ideals. It may even be that certain ideological and epistemological transitions, as advocated, are currently unworkable given that the wider societies, in which schools are situated, are reproducing powerful corporate cosmopolitan ideals entrenched in a set of neo-liberal and knowledge-economy norms. Either way, this points to the need for empirical research into contemporary global citizenship education practice, obstacles and incentives to this practice, and ways in which schools are negotiating the global in all its forms (such as that begun by Burroway et. al. 2000).

Conclusion: prioritising a research agenda

This paper emphasises the need for research that seeks to uncover dominant modes of pedagogic practice and knowledge organisation in mainstream schooling in relation global citizenship education. However, no doubt that the astute reader will recognise that this paper is itself lacking in empirical references and that there has been, undoubtedly, a certain level of oversimplification – some deeper questions relating to global citizenship education knowledge and the curriculum are addressed elsewhere (Marshall 2008; 2009). However, the primary aim of this paper was to critically engage with current global citizenship theory and, in the light of this, to point to the need for theorists and educators to consider a form of cosmopolitan learning that is grounded in the realisation that all forms of global citizenship education are going to have normative and instrumentalist dimensions, that they will be subject to powerful pressures to help young people foster cosmopolitan capital (currently corporate in nature), and that these educational programmes *will* always engage with the idea of the universal in one way or another. The sociological project drafted here necessarily involves questioning the underlying assumptions of education for social transformation, the instrumentalist agendas and the epistemological assumptions.

Rizvi asks how we can develop a conception of cosmopolitan that is ‘not only empirically informed but ethically grounded’ (2009:258) – my request is that we reverse the emphasis of this question, that we develop an understanding that is not only ethically grounded (as I do believe many initiatives are), but also empirically informed. This can be done by ‘facing humanity in all its plurality’ (Todd 2008:x), by utilising a conceptual language of the imaginary and cosmopolitan capital, and by recognising the political, economical, geographical and historical situatedness of all such educational initiatives.

References

Andreotti, V. 2006. Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Development Education Policy and Practice*, Issue 3, Autumn, 83-98.

Andreotti, V. (forthcoming). Glimpses of a postcolonial and postcritical global citizenship education. In G. Elliott, C. Fourali and S. Issler (Eds.) *Education for social change*. London: Continuum.

Andreotti, V. (in press). Global education in the 21st century: two different perspectives on the 'post-' of postmodernism. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*

Balarin, M. (forthcoming). Global citizenship and marginalization – contributions towards a political economy of global citizenship. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*

Banks, J. A. 2008. Diversity, global identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37:3, 129-139.

Beck, J. 1998. *Morality and Citizenship in Education*. London: Cassell.

Beck, U. 2006. *Cosmopolitan vision*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Buraway, M., Blum, J., George, S. and Gille, Z. 2000. *Global ethnography: forces, connections and imaginations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

DCELLS 2008. *Education for sustainable development and global citizenship: a common understanding for schools*. Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills, Welsh Assembly.

DfES 2004. *Putting the world into world-class education: an international strategy for education, skills and children's services*. London: Department for Education and Skills.

DfES 2004. *Putting the world into world class education: an international strategy for education, skills and children's services*. London: Department for Education and Skills. Available online at: <http://www.globalgateway.org.uk/Default.aspx?page=624> (accessed 01/10).

DfES 2005. *Developing the global dimension in the school curriculum*, 2nd edition. London: Department for Education and Skills. Available online at: <http://www.dfes.gov.uk/Documents/publications/dev-global-dim.pdf> (accessed 01/10).

DfES 2007. *Putting the world into world-class education: action plan*. London: Department for Education and Skills. Available online at: <http://www.globalgateway.org.uk/Default.aspx?page=624> (accessed 01/10).

DEA 2009. *DEA's vision for the future: DEA's strategy for 2010-2013*. London: Development Education Association.

Dobson, A. 2003. *Citizenship and the environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Enslin, P. and Tjiattas, M. 2009. Philosophy of education and the gigantic affront of universalism. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 43:1, 2-17

Halpin, D. 1999. Utopian realism and a new politics of education: developing a critical theory without guarantees. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14:4, 345-361.

Held, D. 1995. *Democracy and the global order: from the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. London: Polity Press.

Huckle, J. 2004. Citizenship education for sustainable development in initial teacher training. Available online at *Citized website*, http://www.citized.info/?r_menu=induction&strand=0 (accessed 01/10).

Lauder, H., Brown, P., Dillabough, J., Halsey, A. 2006. *Education, Globalisation and Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, H. 2007. The global education terminology debate: exploring some of the issues in the UK. In *A handbook of research in international education*, ed. M. Hayden, J. Levy, and J. Thompson, 38-50. London: Sage.

Marshall, H. 2008. Education for global citizenship: reflecting upon the instrumentalist agendas at play. Monograph provided for MA International Education Resource Pack, Deakin University, Australia. (CURRENTLY ALSO IN EDITED COLLECTION – UNCONFIRMED)

Marshall, H. 2009. Educating the European citizen in the global age: engaging with the post-national and identifying the research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41:1, 247-267.

Nussbaum, M. C. 2002. Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (ed.) *For love of country?*, 3-17. Boston: Beacon.

Oxfam 2006. *Education for global citizenship: a guide for schools*. Oxford: Oxfam Development Education.

Rizvi, F. 2008. Epistemic virtues and cosmopolitan learning. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 35:1. Accessed online <http://www.articlearchives.com/labor-employment/worker-categories-migrant-workers/890870-1.html> (accessed 01/10).

Rizvi, F. 2009. Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30:3, 253-268.

Roth, K. 2007. Cosmopolitan Learning. In *Changing notions of citizenship education in contemporary nation-states. Educational futures: Rethinking theory and practice*, ed. K. Roth, and N. Burbules, .10-29 Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Todd, S. 2008. *Toward an imperfect education: facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Todd, S. (2009) Facing humanity: the difficult task of cosmopolitan education, Accessed online at http://www.philosophy-of-education.org/conferences/pdfs/Sharon_Todd.pdf

Todd, S. 2009. Toward an imperfect education: the task of facing human pluralism. Unpublished lecture given at the Philosophical Studies in Education SIG, American Education Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting, San Diego, USA, 5/04/09.

Urry, J. 1998. Globalisation and citizenship. Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Lancaster, UK. Available online at: <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/urry-globalisation-and-citizenship.pdf> (accessed 12/09).

Urry, J. 2000. *Sociology beyond societies: mobilities for the twenty-first century*. London: Routledge

Weenink, D. 2008. Cosmopolitanism as a form of capital: parents preparing their children for a globalising world. *Sociology* 42:6, 1089-1106.

Whitehead, K. 2005. 'Advertising advantage: the International Baccalaureate, social justice and the marketisation of schooling'. Paper presented to Australian Association for Research in Education Annual conference, Parramatta, 27 November-1 December 2005. Available online at www.aare.edu.au/05pap/whi05426.pdf (accessed 12/09).

Young, M. (2008) *Bringing knowledge back in: from social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education*, London: Routledge.